UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/523,005	08/09/2005 Yoshinori Fujii		AI 373NP	4657	
23995 RABIN & Berd	7590 04/11/200 lo. PC	EXAMINER			
1101 14TH STI		CASTELLANO, STEPHEN J			
SUITE 500 WASHINGTOI	N, DC 20005	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			3781		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			04/11/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary		Application No		Applicant(s)				
		10/523,005		FUJII, YOSHINORI				
		Examiner		Art Unit				
		/Stephen J. Cas	stellano/	3781				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the cove	er sheet with the c	orrespondence ac	idress			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING asions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by state reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS C 1.136(a). In no event, how and will apply and will expire ute, cause the application	OMMUNICATION wever, may a reply be tin e SIX (6) MONTHS from to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this of D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>12</u>	March 2008						
-	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.							
3)	<i>,</i> —							
٥,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 9</u> is/are pending in the app	lication.						
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-3 and 9</u> is/are rejected.							
· ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
-	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	or election require	ement.					
	on Papers							
	· The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner						
•			niected to by the F	=yaminer				
.0/	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	-	an priority under 2	5118 C & 110/a	(d) or (f)				
	2) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:							
a)	1.☐ Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been rec	eived					
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume			on No				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr				Stago			
		•		su iii tiiis Nationai	Stage			
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
	see the attached detailed Office action for a n	st of the certified c	opies not receive	u.				
Attachmen		-	1					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) A) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Discrete of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Paper No(s)/Mail Date								
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application								
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6) Other:								

Claims 4-8 have been canceled. Claims 1-3 and 9 are pending.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gentry in view of Witmer.

With respect to claim 1, Gentry discloses a packaging container molded of a synthetic resin sheet (see paragraph [0017])having an opening (defined at the upper end of the sidewall 14), the container comprising a flange (rim 16) projecting outwardly from the opening, the flange is provided throughout with regularly distributed minute projections (the uppermost portion or crest of the waves 20) or minute recesses (the lowermost portion or trough of the waves 20) and an outer peripheral edge of the flange forms a vertically (the wave pattern of the outer peripheral edge extends in a vertical direction) corrugated edge (see Fig. 1 and 3-6) defined by a line crossing the projections or recesses (this outer peripheral edge line is substantially circular and has

Art Unit: 3781

the wave pattern, this line is perpendicular to the ridge and groove lines formed by the projections and recesses, respectively). Gentry discloses the projections or recesses arranged in a pattern of a single row with numerous columns. Gentry discloses the invention except for the pattern having at least two rows. Witmer teaches a plate with a flange a pattern of projections (15, 15a) or recesses (16, 16a), the projections or recesses are arranged in a pattern of at least two rows and at least two columns. It would have been obvious to modify the arrangement of the projections and recesses of Gentry by adding another row of projections or recesses or both to Gentry's flange and to align the added row so that the projections or recesses align in columns in order to add rigidity to the flange, eliminate or reduce flexing of the flange and resist bending of the flange so that when the container is grasped and lifted by the flange the flange doesn't bend.

Alternatively, Gentry could be modified by Witmer to include the corrugated pattern of Witmer is substitution of the corrugated pattern of Gentry. It would have been

Art Unit: 3781

obvious to modify the Gentry flange to have the corrugated pattern of Witmer with plural rows and columns in substitution of Gentry's pattern in order to provide the flanged rim with adequate bending resistance. It would have been obvious to do such substitution when the flattening type corrugations of Gentry are not deemed necessary.

With respect to claims 2 & 3, Gentry discloses a waveform of a vertically corrugated edge with a difference (amplitude of the waveform) within the range of not more than 0.5 mm as the stated 11 mils, 17 mils, 16 mils and 18 mils (see paragraphs [0026-0028]) are all within this range. Gentry fails to disclose the stated pitch or wavelength dimensions of a waveform of a vertically corrugated edge, a pitch being not being more than 1.0 mm. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to configure the pitch of the waveform as such, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272,205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980). Reducing the pitch or wavelength of Gentry with the same diameter of the bowl

will effectively increase the total number of waveforms by a factor greater than 2.5 which will increase the reinforcing effect of the waveforms and enhance the bowl's overall strength.

Re claim 9, the outer peripheral edge of Gentry is not being modified. The outer peripheral edge of the flange of Gentry includes alternating minute projections and minute recesses.

Applicant's arguments filed March 12, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant finds that Gentry and Witmer are corrugated for entirely different and opposing reasons and that a combination of their respective teachings would contradict the teachings of each. Gentry's accordion like rim is capable of flattening. Witmer uses corrugations to provide the necessary bending resistance or bending strength. The examiner doesn't find that an accordion like rim with the capability of flattening is inconsistent with a rim that also has corrugations to provide bending resistance. The addition of bending resistance doesn't conflict with the relieving of hoop stress at the flanged rim.

Furthermore, the modification has been made in substitution of Gentry's corrugated structure. Since the corrugations of Gentry are removed, no conflict could exist with Witmer's bending resistance teaching.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/523,005 Page 6

Art Unit: 3781

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen J. Castellano whose telephone number is 571-272-4535. The examiner can normally be reached on increased flexibility plan (IFP).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony D. Stashick can be reached on 571-272-4561. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/523,005 Page 7

Art Unit: 3781

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Stephen J. Castellano/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 3781

sjc